

W/H Torgast

Federal Bureau of Investigation
Attn: Cleveland Field Office
1501 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114




James E. Horton
N/A Indigent
Email Address: jehorton@gmail.com
February 11, 2020

Federal Bureau of Investigation
1501 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114

On 01012020, I reported portions of the attached information via the FBI's online tip form. I selected "Ohio" for region. Limitations of content precluded report as thoroughly intended. Therefore, I am, hereby, corresponding to report full intent in letter by mail.

Sincerely,


James E. Horton, P.O. Sec. 101
P.O. Box 101

INFORMATION

I am currently representing various "Armed Parties" tampering, destroying evidence, Conspiracy to Commit Unconstitutional infractions, various heinous crimes of Harassment, etc. I am certain that some acts are retaliatory-malicious toward this innocent, potential witness.

I am not alone but I am not alone in organized criminal activities. Documentations should be self-explanatory.

From: Ferra Pileggi

To: Me

Date: 1/23/2020 11:45 AM

I agree with my sister-in-law. We don't usually make a copy of the sheet with someone's name in it. I did photocopy it and enclose it for you.

From: Ferra Pileggi

To: Me

Date: 1/23/2020 9:34 PM

Thank you for your response. I appreciate the query report of case numbers associated with same name as mine. It was helpful toward my objective.

Since "Personal papers and effects have been illegally seized and stolen by conspirators colluding in misconduct," I need to identify specific case pertinent for recovery of my personal records. Could you please inform by reply of which cases of either 2001 JCV 16343, 2001 JCR 2004, 2003DR00063 or 2003JG011286 also mention our Marie Brosky or Marie Beaver as party? Thank you.

From: Ferra Pileggi

To: Me

Date: 1/23/2020 7:23 AM

Hi, Honore.

This department only applies to the CR and JCV cases. CR cases are public record and your case, 2003DR00063, does not refer to Marie Brosky or Marie Beaver. As to the JCV case (2001 JCV 16343), this is not public record so I cannot give you any information. If you are in town, please come in with your picture ID and we will give you any info you want. If you are out of town, please make a copy of your driver's license and have it notarized and send it to us with your request.

2001 JCV 16343 ♦ Call the Juvenile Criminal Department at (330) 451-7757

2003JG011286 ♦ Call the Civil Department at (330) 451-7795

From: Me

To: Ferra Pileggi

Date: 1/23/2020 7:25 PM

I am certain, living my life, that there was a CR case pending 1999 through 2004 approximately. Marie Brosky was party. During, her name changed to Beaver. It involved custody of one Joe Honson. The others are her juvenile delinquency cases while in custody of the former and an African-American foster family who harassed me for non-entitled child support. What is the number of this custody case requested? Also, please provide by reply summary information of 2007030022.

If the case described with my request does not exist, there conspicuously has been criminal record tampering and destruction. I do have proof of organized crime motive. It has been a recurring problem in my matters from these organized criminals colluding with infiltrated.

What is this number. What is 2007030022, a separate case about? expect obligatory answer

From: Cathy Allen

To: Me

Date: 1/23/2020 7:54 AM

Any questions regarding this case please contact Stark County Family Court (2007030022) ♦ Any further questions you can contact me at 330-451-7792. Thank you, Cathy.

From: Ferra Pileggi

Sent: Thursday, January 23, 2020 10:41 AM

To: Cathy Allen

Subject: FW: Searching James E. Honson

Cathy,

Please read all of the emails. He sent the latest one and I don't know what to answer. Thank you, Ferra

On Thu, Jan 2, 2020, 7:23 AM Ferra Pileggi <fpileggi@starkcountyohio.gov> wrote:

(pileggi sent, by reply, above emails to Cathy Allen)

From: Me

To: CMAllen@starkcountyohio.gov

Date: 1/19/2020 9:59 PM

Hello,

I have been redirected with my inquiries. For clarity, do you work for the Stark County Court of Common Pleas? A search of its website was without results. If so, what job description do you have?

In my situation communications need to be by email. I am extremely time-consuming by various malicious, procedural harassments and obstructions. It is not practical to attempt phone calls. Email is available for efficient, convenient correspondence in matters.

From: Cathy Allen

To: Me

Date: 1/16/2020 6:00 AM

Yes, I work for Stark County Clerk of Courts, family court division. [Concluded]

Below is content of a Petition for Writ of Mandate prejudiced by District Court of California. Subsequently, the Supreme Court procedurally defaulted (criminally) on challenging Petition for Writ of Review denying its delivery. I have postal tracking proof that it was delivered.

By my experiences, I have reason to know that some of these involved conspirators are members of an "Attorney Unit" criminally colluding, ex parte, with all public official parties coercing themselves on these matters interstate. This anomalous "Attorney Unit" is mentioned within.

Content cited from said petitions.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT. Superior Court No. 15-6705, 13-3628, 13-23865, 14-1219. Court of Appeal No. PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE AND MOTION TO JOIN DER CAUSES FOR EXTRAORDINARY RELIEF. TOP PRESIDING JUDGE OF THE COURT OF APPEAL THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF YOLO, THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT. WHEREFORE, here comes Petitioner, James E. Horton, moving this Court to: 1. immediately stay all proceedings in primary case at issue, case 15-6705, until further order of this Court of Appeal; 2. issue a peremptory writ of mandate commanding Respondent Court to overturn conviction upon mistrial and wrongful verdict and dismiss charge because of denial of Petitioner's fundamental rights to Speedy Trial and Due Process; 3. Joinder of all other cases named herein as causes for Extraordinary Remedy together with primary case, immediately stay all proceedings for each, and issue a peremptory writ to mandate commanding Respondent Court to dismiss all other respective charges (13-3628, 13-23865, and 14-1219) and to terminate all prosecutorial action against Petitioner with item #2 above; and 4. Any such other relief as may be appropriate and just. STATEMENT OF FACTS. Three years and seven months ago, prosecutorial action (still pending) was initiated against Petitioner, James E. Horton. Public Officials, together, have committed the following actions (both in court and out-of-court colluding):

* The first case (case: 13-3628) amongst Malicious series of Prosecutorial Harassments initiated 06/24/2013 charging violation of Resisting Arrest. Immediately post arraignment, Public defender (Ron Howard) overzealously and inexplicably raised Unreasonable and Malicious Doubt of Petitioner's COMPETENCE TO STAND TRIAL during open pretrial conference. Howard based Doubt raised solely on police report without adequate consultation due per Fiduciary Duty respective to an Attorney's Oath. Furthermore, during same hearing, Public Defender requested to "Fast Track" said case as he verbalized according as to local procedure invented as termed (at least at current time). Procedure (anomalous and arbitrary) was granted upon his request. It prejudiced fundamental Due Process Rights prima-facie; therefore, in response, Petitioner filed a Faretta motion raising issue of Substantial Conflict Irreconcilable due to Incompetent and Ineffective Counsel by the Public Defenders' Office. Court granted, upon second Faretta motion, Waiver of Counsel and Self-Representation on 02/24/2014. Since Waiver of Counsel, Petitioner filed pretrial motions (timely and proper with full merit) defending that prosecution lacked probable cause upon a pretextual, malicious, false arrest. These were prejudicially denied. Court maliciously continued pursuing wrongful prosecution. Petitioner continued challenging prejudicial errors and denials yet case is still pending.

* Subsequent to this first arraignment, an overburdening series of actions began. Four additional, frivolous charges initiated. At respective arraignments, Counsel was appointed for three of them (Cases: 13-23865, 14-1219 and 14-4497). During pendencies, appointed counsel orally motioned for another anomalous procedure for all these subsequent cases together which Judge Daniel Maguire agreed to and ordered. Said to be "trailing," but not joindered, all cases versus Petitioner were made to be scheduled consecutively and concurrently on the docket. As a result, all hearings were scheduled for all cases simultaneously. Scheduled hearings, actually, were discriminatorily truncated with obstructionist effect. Throughout, Maguire continually prejudiced Petitioner's time for Due Process procedure to be heard on matters for even first case while others were postponed and said to be "trailing" as aforementioned. Ironically, abusing discretion, he rationalized claiming "interest of the time of the court" with an "overburdened docket." Contrarily, Petitioner continually argued "court maliciously discriminated against him when considering same basis..."

* Subsequent case: 13-23865 also initiated by the West Sacramento Police Department upon first contact on 10/07/2013. Petitioner, on date, was charged with Illegal Scavenging... for taking one bottle from a garbage can... On 05/09/2014, Petitioner appeared in Department 7 (of old court house in Woodland) of Criminal Court before Judge Maguire for hearing upon Motion to Dismiss in first case (13-3628). Suddenly, in open court, judge opened proceeding by presenting unexpected Petitioner with the addition of this case to the Criminal Court docket. Judge called Public Defender, Karen Soell (present for other cases on same day's docket), to the bench since appointed at pretrial conference in case numbered: 13-23865 on 04/09/2014. Per incompetent, arbitrary request of said public defender, Respondent court grossly abused discretion granting invented procedure that Due Process for said case "trail" case 13-3628. Thereby, in effect, Due Process on subsequent case was postponed until completion of first case. Otherwise, court treated case as if joindered in error within minutes recorded, and yet severally, for each case Counsel's request was without consent of Petitioner and without consultation. Consequently, procedure on it has thus far been totally neglected, then deprived? procrastinated on by public officials. Meanwhile, minutes for each proceeding are recorded severally for all case dockets simultaneously as scheduled concurrently (as if joindered without relevant nexus) and with inadequate time for oral hearing procedure imposed? gross procedural anomaly unjustifiable.

* Case: 14-1219 involves charge of a camping infraction... Facts of incident upon which citation was based include: 1) Circumstantially... He sat under an overhang to escape rain (on said date) with unprotected case files and work product on his person. He informed the... Officer of these exculpatory facts during an investigatory stop. Still, the officer, irrespective of Totality of Circumstances, cited... frivolously. This case also was transferred in error to Department 7 of Criminal Court by anomalous procedure. Actually, (by malicious incompetence) two arraignments were set. As reflected by Minutes within Case summary report, an arraignment as scheduled aforesaid in Traffic Court for 03/26/2014 was rescheduled (recorded in minutes to be "vacated?"), ex-parte and out-of-court, to earlier date of 03/24/2014 in Criminal Court, Department 7 (of old court house in Woodland) and "Assigned to Judge Maguire." Petitioner appeared on same date as scheduled for Trial Setting Conference in first case: 13-3628. He was suddenly presented unexpectedly with the addition of this case to the Criminal Court docket two days prior to its actual, original arraignment in Traffic Court. Petitioner was then spontaneously arraigned. He pled Not Guilty. Public Defender was appointed. At Pre-Trial Conference on 04/29/2014, per request of Public Defender granted in error, said case was accrued to dockets of "trailing?" cases as aforementioned (contrary to Petitioner's stated desires for defense). Case is still pending, "trailing?" also neglected.

* Anomalous procedure motioned for aforesaid grossly prejudiced Petitioner prima-facie. By such gross abuses of discretion, Due Process has been grossly denied. Petitioner expressed contrary desires during very few, inadequate consultations with counsel. Furthermore, although cases subsequent were repeatedly vacated (unspoken) as "trailing," still records (Minute Sheets and Case Summary Reports) falsely reflect "Matter Heard?" for hearings in each severally. Thereby, cases have compounded together to Overburden simultaneously. Above also constitutes extreme Abuse of Legal Process violating petitioner's Speedy Trial and Fair Trial Rights. Repeatedly (both to counsel in meeting and in open court), he has raised discrepancy about these acts of Procedural Misconduct and Harassment. Continually, he has been prejudicially ignored on issue. Court has responded only incrementally more and more Malicious and Retaliatory.

* During pendencies, Court obligated Petitioner to attend total of 45 pretrial hearings and 3 days of 1 trial for which sentence hearing and judgement are delayed. The trial is not concluded. Hearings have resulted in a long train of blatant prejudicial denials flying in the face of Constitutional Rights.

* Since commencements, Petitioner successfully raised issues of substantial conflict due to ineffective counsel (completely adverse to adequate defense violating attorney-client privilege and Attorney's Oath) and right to waive counsel. Therefore, court granted right to self-represent in all case during oral hearing on 12/07/2015 upon reasoning above herein. Need for competent counsel necessitated assertion of right? Petitioner is law trained.

14. A case 14-4497 initiated by Woodland Police Department alleging violation of PC 241.5(1). Facts are that a letter is posted Petitioner by launching an
 France to Police Station retaliating against his intent to acquire a citizen's complaint form concerning prior misconduct. Based on such statements upon review by
 district (of Petitioner Pro Se) and for lack of sufficient evidence on 01/27/2016. As a result Petitioner made to let a law
 Numerous times in various ways with no result.

Present case concerns Plaintiff's alleged violation of his right to a FAIR TRIAL PREJUDICED BY PROTRACTED RESTRAINT OF HIS LIBERTY. Plaintiff argues that

On 02/17/2016, Petitioner filed Common Law Motion to Dismiss Because of Denial of Right to Speedy Trial. (Court Case and Case) That is cause. (02/17/2016) denying Fundamental Rights. (Please refer to Appendix - Also, on 02/19/2016, he filed Motion to dismiss the denial of Speedy Trial. (Speedy Trial) responsive to Prosecution's untimely disclosure of discovery and in open court during jury trial date on 02/19/2016. There is the acknowledgment of judicially derived both motions on 03/23/2016. (Please refer to Appendix - On 04/08/2016, the judge ruled in favor of the defendant, dismissing the motions on 03/23/2016. (Court Case and Case) That is cause. (04/08/2016)

[illegible]

Actually, proceedings since 06/22/2016 constituted "Missive 1." Attributed the "missives" on 06/17/2016. Petitioner's request suspended continuance (with showing of cause and merit) in lieu of inordinate, untimely delay (by Appellate Department) of decisions upon her Motion for Writ of Habeas and Request for Stay herein. In response, Judge Maguire 1) vacated conference until 06/17/2016, 2) then ordered parties to file papers, and 3) vacated date of 06/17/2016 informing Appellate Department concerning delays as above. Thereby only less than two days were given for submission of papers, particularly with regard for statutory procedure of issue (reasonable deadline). On 06/17/2016, prior to hearing Petitioner (being procedurally overruled) raised inquiry filed on 06/22/2016 (FILED 06/22/16) ONLY BRIEF addressing, as order, issue of said delays. (Please refer to Appendix 1.)

At continued hearing on 06/17/2016, Judge Maguire informed of denial of stay and set jury selection to begin 06/22/2016, and propounded his motions for mistrial. Petitioner (at least) twice orally moved for mistrial upon above facts. He motioned on same date in paper court 06/17/2016, and then during evidentiary procedure hearing (06/22/2016). Judge reasoned, in part, that he only accepts motions in writing, and being not prepared (a mistake).

Post further gross abuses of discretion occurring between 10/15/1976 and 10/19/1976, that willfully persisted on 01/22/1978. Unusual from 1976

During voir dire selection on 06/23/2016, Supervisor of Woodland Police Department Detective [redacted] was introduced to jury pool and possession of Office Agent of Party in Interest evidenced intent to collude and conspire in acts of targeting activities July 1, 2016, causing the [redacted] evolution of a Rained/July

During fact-finding, prosecution based its case solely upon non-*Coffey* evidence.

- Fabricated facts testified by informant as first witness (being incompetent, interested, in charge, inconsistent and contradictory and thus challenged by Petitioner's motion to impeach on the record, and during cross-examination) (Black's Law Dictionary 4th Edition 6th Edition 1991).
Electronic audio recording of dispatch call ? the initial accusation ? reported by said first witness (which included audible background of Petitioner, from a distance, crying about the false report while departing).
Second and last witness, Officer Guthrie of the Woodland Police Department testified that he did not witness incident at scene of complaint while further of testimony only evidenced that Petitioner had departed scene of incident without fighting.

Yet, jury reached wrongful verdict of "guilty" and Petitioner was wrongfully convicted of violation of P.C. ss 415.

Furthermore, trial, to this date, is still incomplete. Court is delaying sentencing, hence judgement, egregiously inordinate. Jury deliberation and verdict on 06/24/2016 has been last trial decision thus far. Judge, on same date, continued sentencing phase until 06/29/2016. Therefore, under such "Extraordinary Circumstances?" (specific with respect to delayed sentencing and judgement in bad-faith), Petitioner, on 06/28/2016, filed Motion to vacate Judgement arguing following headed points: CAS STILL PENDING UPON INORDINATELY DELAYED DECISION ON (PETITIONER'S) PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE, and that FAIR TRIAL PREJUDICIAL HARMED BY UNLUE INFLUENCE UPON JURY. (Please refer to Appendix _____)

On 06/29/2016, at continued sentencing hearing, Maguire (conspicuously) retaliated maliciously against my most recent motion and with motive and intent preemptively obstruct Post-Trial and succeeding causes for civil actions. On the record, the hearing was completely one-sided? Obstructionist! Petitioner appeared prepared to orally in support and in defense on issues relevant to sentencing by statute. He attempted to raise and then asserted to raise them. Maguire instantly denied Due Process precluding right to speak. Continually, he interrupted attempts to assert right for hearing on matter. Furthermore, he reversed accused petitioner overbearing insisting he not?interrupt? Maguire also forbade right to state objections during an Unconstitutional, ex-parte?presentation? by the District Attorney's Office.

part acted to unjustly Duress Petitioner to accept settlement offer for a nonstatutory, Unconstitutional alternate to sentencing. Judge opened with prosecution. A Christopher Bulkeley, Deputy District Attorney appeared present ? not prosecutor on record in the case and during trial (Fntz Van Der Hoek). Bulkeley gave improper, prepared presentation endorsing (on record) a newly conceived ?program? ? the ?Diversionary Homeless Program.? Accordingly, Petitioner would be Coerced to concede to Admission of Guilt, progress through stages of a thought-control program, accept ?Incompetent to Stand Trial? status and controlled, free housing for definite period of time (when I am not even native to this state or county).

...ent to Maliciously Raise Doubt about Competence to Stand Trial! Maguire threatened (even Blackmailed) with Prejudice in Sentencing Phase ? an excessive, maximum jail term (upon wrongful conviction while refusing to hear Petitioner on issues at hand for which he came prepared) as ultimatum to offer ? an alternate to

hearing although present. Judge called break for lunch at end of calendared docket session. He then, as recurrence amongst 47 hearings frequented by such prejudicial treatment, rationalized that my cases involve too many issues and take too long. Meanwhile, matters for others were heard dramatically longer than typical for Petitioner at bench. Omission constituted flagrant Due Process denial and Procedural Harassment. Improper, it caused excessive disruption to my day. I had other matters to tend to and for survival being discriminatorily delayed in court.

During scheduled session, a bailiff of the Sheriff's Department vindictively baited to entrap with discriminatory action in open court. Petitioner entered line to approach bench. Bailiff initiated to remove me from the courtroom unreasonably and imprudently. Off the record, as session concluded, Petitioner urgently communicated (as he was being removed) asserting his right for hearing without inordinate prejudicial delay effected. Judge silently ignored, left bench for lunchbreak without acknowledging issue.

Petitioner returned 1440 during afternoon docket for addressal of issue. During interim, he had tended to personal necessary matters not able to arrive at exactly 0130 when, circumstantially, court procedurally defaulted previous. Also, it is customary for counsel to arrive enter line during course of session to be heard. Same bailiff persisted enforcing that Petitioner remain outside courtroom and presented minute order recording. People request a warrant based upon Defendant's contempt behavior in court. Petitioner requested callback. After Bailiff attempted further baiting with repeated, irrelevant, circular questioning and responses, he accommodated.

Judge called Petitioner to bench then informed on record that he refused to hear him on date. Specific Deputy District Attorney was now absent although others were then present. Matters were not continued. Judge imposed one minute for requested statement on the record and cut it short.

Petitioner's spoken words were not in themselves contemptuous nor uttered in an insolent or defiant manner (Rose v Superior court in and for Los Angeles County (1934) 140 Cal. App. 418). He acted within right, in context, addressing blatant denial of Due Process as Constitutional Fundamental Right. His act possessed justifiable showing of cause necessary toward aggressive defense addressing distressingly expedient issue, especially factoring extraordinary circumstances resulting from prolonged pattern of Abuse of Legal Process harassing petitioner in a harmful manner (as above). His statement failed to warn before taking disciplinary action against (Petitioner) during ex-parte proceeding subsequent with Prosecutor (Gallagher v Municipal Court of City of Los Angeles (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 784; in re Buckley (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 237).

Petitioner did not persistently interrupt court proceedings (as) an attorney as to embarrass the administration of justice (in re Hallmann (1932) 126 Cal. App. 121). Pro Se, he possessed the duty to protect (his) interests (as Defendant) and press legitimate argument and to protest an erroneous ruling which was, by omission, act obstructing justice by Due Process (in re Hallmann, Supra).

Here, summary contempt power must not stifle freedom of thought and speech so necessary to a fair trial under the adversary system (in re Hallmann, Supra). The court must not unduly interfere with representation's obligation to vigorously represent interests of a Defendant. Apparent disrespect was objectively clear but the subjective impression of the judge (DeGeorge v Superior Court (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 305). Extraordinary Circumstance of Overburden in lieu of Abuses of Legal Process make it impracticable for Petitioner to file timely several motions at issue (such as Change of Venue, Disqualify Judge and Prosecutor) not several Petitions for each case. Therefore, it would be in the interest of justice for Court to order stay on all proceedings in all cases against Petitioner per requests and in joinder of causes. Doctrine of laches (in fairness) rules at issue.

James E. Horton, In Propria Persona

DECLARATION OF JAMES E. HORTON IN SUPPORT PURSUANT TO CA Rules Of Court 8.486(3) IN LIEU OF NON POSSESSION OF PROPER TRANSCRIPTS

I, James E. Horton, as Defendant In Propria Persona, declare under penalty of perjury, on information and belief, under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Whereas, on 06222016, Petitioner filed request for transcript of trial readiness conference on 06152016 with Court Reporter's Office at Respondent Court.

Whereas, on 06232016, Petitioner filed request for transcript of trial beginning 0622016.

Whereas, on trial date of 06242016, obviously responsive to requests filed aforesaid, court reporter, Lisa Schafer, approached Petitioner present in courtroom communicating transcripts would not ever be provided to him. She claimed: her manager informed her of policy accordingly instructed her to inform petitioner of said policy based on grounds that a fee waiver was never ordered covering (when a fee waiver had been granted recorded in court file which Petitioner previously had received transcripts upon during pre-trial and when such delivery is at cost of the state in criminal proceedings by statute and relevant Judicial Council rules).

Whereas, on 06242016, petitioner filed application for fee waiver specifically for transcripts and Respondent filed order denying request on either 06252016 or 06272016 reasoning, Judgment has not issued and no appeal is pending. Request may be re-submitted after entry of judgment. Judge dated order signed as:

June 25, 2016. Case Summary Report reflects Order denying Fee Waiver dated 06272016.

Whereas, on 06272016, Petitioner filed request for hearing about court fee waiver order, court set order to appeal order for 07272016 which was continued since Petitioner was denied procedure on said date.

Whereas on 07012016, Petitioner filed application for waiver specifying request for transcripts to attach to Petitions despite for appeal other proper motions for extraordinary relief.

Whereas, court has procedurally defaulted on ignoring Petitioner's application filed 07012016.

Whereas, Petitioner filed Request to Waive Additional Court Fees on 07152016 specifying transcripts were needed for Petitions and for Faretta motion, not appeal.

Whereas, on 07192016, judge, delaying request filed 07152016, ordered another fee waiver hearing date for 08242016 being same date set for continued sentencing, warrant review, hearing upon Faretta motion and multitude of other matters for all cases simultaneously as Procedural Harassment and Abuse of Legal Process. Thereby, despite Petitioner's full-faith and diligence to acquire proper transcripts, Respondent Court has denied delivery and they are unavailable for attachment.

MOTION TO DISQUALIFY JUDGES

Petitioner, James E. Horton, Pro se, In forma pauperis, now comes attesting as follows:

Numerous contingencies of cases at issue to petition attached show, prima facie, that public officials at the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Yolo, respondent, possesses malice intent toward him and are hostile to his Fundamental Rights. They are clearly incapable of being impartial.

Respondent is harming said Petitioner's ability to prepare defense with unjust overburden by accumulative prosecutorial harassment, speedy trial and due process denials and infractions disrupting his life. Therefore, he lacks time for further research at issue for this motion.

Wherefore, Petitioner hereby moves this court, however, to issue its decision, mandate or order, upon whatever merits by applicable law are obvious prima facie, to disqualify all judges of said respondent court from hearing matters and adjudicating further in Petitioner's cases immediately with stay. Even if precedential, granting this motion serves the interest of justice when weighing presumptive issues...

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF

THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA James E. Horton Case No.: C08425 MOTION TO COMPEL RECORD AND TRANSCRIPTS NEEDED FOR REVIEW

Despite Petitioner's full-faith and diligence to acquire adequate record, Respondent Court has denied delivery and it is unavailable for attachment. (Please refer to Declaration IN SUPPORT PURSUANT TO CA RULES OF COURT 8.486(3) IN LIEU OF NON-POSSESSION OF PROPER TRANSCRIPTS attached as pg. 23 of Appendix A.) Petitioner has conveyed, to Appellate Court, intent to compel documents from lower court and Real Party in Interest subsequent to and upon

U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT
Domestic Mail Only

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com®.

Certified Mail Fee

Extra Services & Fees (Add fee to Certified Mail fee)

- ☐ Return Receipt (hard copy) \$
- ☐ Return Receipt (electronic) \$
- ☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery \$
- ☐ Adult Signature Required \$
- ☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery \$

Postage

Total Postage and Fees

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State ZIP+4®

Cleveland, OH 44114

PS Form 3800, April 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9047

See Reverse for Instructions

Certified

(USPS Certified Mail®)

\$3.55



7019 2280 0002 0127 9286

